

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 12, 18-29 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 11, 21 and 26 are independent.

Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 12, 18-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sato (USPN 6,408,435) in view of Goldstein (USPN 5,410,326).

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

To be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the prior art (i.e., Sato and Goldstein) must teach all of the features of the rejected claims. Applicant contends, and as will be shown, that the combination of references fail to teach many of the features of the rejected claims.

On page 3 of the Office Action it is admitted that Sato does not teach “determining code for graphically representing a controllable feature of the appliance on the graphic user interface of the control device” as recited in claim 1. The Office Action points to Goldstein, col. 3, lines 21-26 and col. 7, lines 9-32.

However, claim 1 recites “determining code for graphically representing a controllable feature of the appliance” (emphasis added).

Claim 11 recites: “wherein a programming of the programmable user interface is facilitated by the user interface code; and wherein the user interface code is for graphically representing a controllable feature of the one or more electronic devices on the user interface” (emphasis added).

This is different from both Sato and Goldstein.

Sato and Goldstein both teach determining the code to control an appliance. Sato apparently teaches that new device codes may be downloaded into a controller to control new devices or a sequence of device codes may be downloaded in order to facilitate a group of

commands needed to record shows at different times. Goldstein apparently teaches that graphics on a touch screen may be the user interface for controlling the features of the appliance (a GUI interface).

However, neither reference teaches or suggests that, for example, a new graphic representing a controllable feature of an appliance could be downloaded into a control device. While Sato may suggest new sets of codes for controlling an appliance may be downloaded to the controller and Goldstein may suggest a GUI may be used to activate that set of codes, nowhere is there any suggestion that a new graphical representation is downloaded to the controller. In other words, downloading a new graphic to the GUI in the controller of Goldstein.

Even if the combination of Sato and Goldstein suggest downloading new control codes to control devices, neither suggests “determining code for graphically representing a controllable feature of the appliance; communicating the code to the control device for storage at the control device for enabling user-control of the appliance in response to a subsequent user activation of the control device” as in claim 1. Thus, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements.

As pointed out above, independent claim 11 recites programming of the programmable user interface is facilitated by the user interface code, the user interface code is for graphically representing a controllable feature. Similarly as in claim 1, Goldstein may use a GUI to allow the user to select a control sequence to program an appliance, but there is no suggestion in either of Sato or Goldstein of the claimed features of claim 11. Downloading codes that are used for programming the appliance is different from receiving user interface codes for graphically representing a controllable feature.

Furthermore, claim 11 recites: programming of the programmable user interface. Both Sato and Goldstein describe that the codes are used by the controller to program the appliance. In contrast claim 11 recites programming of the programmable user interface. Thus, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements of claim 11.

Independent claim 21 recites: “storing in a server codes for graphically representing on a graphic user interface of a remote control device one or more controllable features of a plurality of devices.”

The Office Action points to the arguments presented for claim 1, however, claim 1 does not recite this feature of claim 21 and neither of Sato nor Goldstein even remotely suggest storing in a server codes for graphically representing....

Independent claim 26 recites providing, to a server, an identification of at least one device, the device being one of a plurality of devices having codes stored in the server for graphically representing on a graphic user interface of a remote control device one or more controllable features of the device. Even if Sato suggests a web site to retrieve codes to program an appliance, there is no suggestion of codes for graphically representing on a graphic user interface of a remote control device.

Claims 3-7, 12, 18-20, 22-25, 26-29 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 11, 21 or 26, which have been shown to be allowable over the prior art combination of references. Accordingly, claims 3-7, 12, 18-20, 22-25, 26-29 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from the allowable base claims, as well as the additional features recited in each dependent claim. Allowances is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's correspondence and conclude the prosecution of this case. In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian S. Myers  
Registration No.: 46,947  
For: Larry Liberchuk,  
Registration No.: 40,352

**Mail all correspondence to:**

Larry Liberchuk, Registration No. 40,352  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9602  
Fax: (914) 332-0615